

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/200,523	11/25/1998	ŞYED AON MUJTABA	4927		
75	590 08/20/2004		EXAMINER		
JOSEPH B RYAN			ELALLAM, AHMED		
RYAN & MASON & LEWIS, LLP 90 FOREST AVENUE			ART UNIT PAPER NUME		
	LEY, NY 11560		2662	<b>-3:-</b> : ·	
			DATE MAILED: 08/20/2004	02	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		_					
Office Action Summary		Application	Application No. Applicant(s)				
		09/200,52	23	MUJTABA, SYED AON			
		Examiner		Art Unit			
		AHMED	ELALLAM	2662			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communica r Reply	tion appears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addre	)SS		
THE I - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failui Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA is ions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) depend for reply is specified above, the maximum statute to treply within the set or extended period for reply will, eply received by the Office later than three months after ad patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION.  If CFR 1.136(a). In no evication.  ays, a reply within the state only period will apply and will by statute, cause the app	ent, however, may a reply be tin utory minimum of thirty (30) day Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS from lication to become ABANDONE	nely filed  s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this common (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.		
Status							
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on 28 June 2004.					
•		☐ This action is n	on-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)	Claim(s) 1-3,5-10,12-17 and 19-21 is/a  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are v  Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-3,5-10,12-17 and 19-21 is/a  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction  on Papers  The specification is objected to by the E  The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)  Applicant may not request that any objectio  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	withdrawn from core rejected.  In and/or election references.  Examiner.  I accepted or b)  In to the drawing(s) be correction is require	equirement.  objected to by the lead in abeyance. See the diff the drawing(s) is objected in abeyance.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR	` '		
11)[	The oath or declaration is objected to by	tne Examiner. No	ite the attached Oπice ,	Action or form P1O-	152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some col None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
2) 🔲 Notice 3) 🔯 Inform	(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO- nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO No(s)/Mail Date <u>July 1, 2004</u> .		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	ate			

Art Unit: 2662

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

This communication is responsive to the RCA filed on June 28, 2004 The Amendment has been entered.

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-17 and 19-21 are pending.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. Claims 1-3, 6-10, 13-17, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alamouti et al, US (5,933,421) in view of Sjoberg et al, (Performance evaluation of the Zipper duplex method), IEEE 1998, pages 1035-1039 and further in view of Baum et al, US (5,867,478).

Regarding claims 1, 8 and 15, with reference to figure 1, Alamouti discloses a wireless cellular communication system in which a plurality of remote stations (U, V) communicate with a base station Z, the base station receiving a first incoming wireless signal comprising a plurality of first discrete frequency tones that are orthogonal frequency division multiplexed (OFDM) in a first frequency band from a first remote station (U), and a second incoming wireless signal comprising a plurality of second

Art Unit: 2662

discrete frequency tones that are orthogonal frequency division multiplexed (OFDM) in a the first frequency band from a second remote station (V), and that the first and second remote stations have different sets of discrete frequency tones. See column 5, lines 21-67. In addition, Alamouti discloses that the base station transmit a first wireless outgoing signal 18 comprising a plurality of third discrete frequency tones FI that are orthogonal frequency division multiplexed (OFDM) in a second frequency band to the first remote station (U), and that the first remote station and base station use different sets of discrete frequency tones (F2, F!), see column 9, lines 66-67 and column 10, lines 1-13. Alamouti further discloses that the total signal frequency band is divided into N frequency orthogonal sub-channels, see column 3, lines 7-24, and that the total bandwidth of the airlink (uplink and downlink) is divided into a lower band and upper band. See column 13, lines 9-20.

Alamouti does not disclose assigning to one of uplink and down link a k carriers in a set of M OFDM carriers in a given frequency band, and assigning to the other of the uplink and down link the remaining M-k carriers in the set of M carriers, wherein adaptive duplexing between uplink and down link is achievable by varying the value of k.

However, Sjoberg discloses a Zipper Duplex in which different DMT sub-carriers (Discrete Multi-tone carriers are allocated dynamically for the upstream and downstream, and that the number of upstream sub-carrier and the number of downstream sub-carriers are complimentary to each other (claimed k and M-k sub-

Art Unit: 2662

carriers), the Zipper transmits and receives simultaneously. See pages 1035-1036, paragraphe II.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary person of skill in the art at the time the invention was made to enable the OFDM allocation of Alamouti with the teaching of dynamic upstream and downstream DMT-subcarrier allocation of Sjoberg so that adaptive bandwidth allocation can be provided.

Alamoti/Sioberg do not disclose that communications between the base station and a subset of the plurality of subscribers units are separated from one another using one or more sector-specific spreading codes, wherein the sector-specific codes being associated with a corresponding sector of an antenna of the base station.

However, Baum discloses in the same field of orthogonal frequency division multiple access (OFDM), assigning sector-specific spreading code to separate subscribers from one another, the sector-specific codes being associated with a corresponding sector of an antenna of the base station. See column 5, lines 56-67 and column 6, lines 1-65.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary person of skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the sectorizing method taught by Baum in the system of Alamoti/Sioberg by recognizing the advantage in co-channel reduction that the teaching of Baum does provide. The implementation of Baum's sectorizing on method by a skilled artisan in Alamoti/Sioberg's system would increase the number of subscribers using the network in addition to a better quality signals due to the noise reduction.

Art Unit: 2662

Regarding claims 2, 9 and 16, Alamouti discloses that the wireless unit can be fixed. See column 8, lines 20-28.

Regarding claims 3, 10 and 17, Alamouti discloses that the first and second wireless signals from the remote units (U, V) to the base station Z, and the third wireless signal form the base station Z to the first remote unit (U) are transmitted in different TDMA intervals, see column 9, lines 19-67, and column 10, lines 1-13. (Corresponding to using Time Division Multiple Access for separating communication between a subset of the subscriber units).

Regarding claims 6, 13 and 20, with reference to figure 1.7, Alamouti discloses an inverse Fourier transform operation at the base station.

Regarding claims 7, 14 and 21, with reference to figure 1.10, Alamouti discloses a Fourier transform operation at base station receiver system to recover multiplexed orthogonal frequency division multiplexed carrier.

2. Claims 5, 12, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alamouti/Sjoberg/Baum as applied to respective claims 1, 8 and 15 above, and further in view of Frodigh et al, US (5,726,978).

Regarding claims 5, 12, 19, Alamouti/Sjoberg/Baum discloses substantially all the limitations of parent claims 1, 8 and 15, except it doesn't explicitly disclose that the number of carriers in uplink and downlink sets is varies across the time slots in accordance with uplink and down link demand.

Art Unit: 2662

However, Frodigh, with reference to figures 2 and 7, discloses an adaptive channel allocation method in an OFDMA system in which each up/down link capacities between a mobile and a base station are allocated based on bandwidth requests see column 7, lines 39-50 and column 13, lines 23-46.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary person of skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Frodigh's adaptive channel allocation (OFDM allocations) with the OFDMA/timeslots allocation of Alamouti/Sjoberg/Baum so to increase the capacity of the system.

## **Response to Arguments**

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 8, and 15 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AHMED ELALLAM whose telephone number is (703) 308-6069. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kizou Hassan can be reached on (703) 305-4744. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AHMED ELALLAM Examiner
Art Unit 2662
August 18, 2004

JOHN PEZZLO
PRIMARY EXAMINER